Johnny’s essays on AI, pt. 2: **Why AI “art”? Or: the goal of AI content.**

This attempts to continue with the reasons why AI generated content exists in the first place, and why it might appeal to some, and the issues with it. This series of essays more or less compiles arguments with the intention of showing the common folk who might be interested in AI why you should not support generative AI.

AI is intended to be a replacement. It’s a way of suppressing the working class by preventing them from having direct control over culture, and essentially killing off those who create it. Even if used as a “tool” this ignores the point is to kill off the artists themselves in the long term.

Is it true that this generative AI exists only because of capitalism? It seems to be the main reason, at least to me. Because who would want an algorithm to create something which looks good, but with no soul, no effort, no emotion put into it? It might seem like a cool experiment at first, until you see where it’s going. It’s basically a waste of electricity and water. Under capitalism, the point is to automate everything, do anything to pay the workers less. So, this means, mass-produce cheap “art”. And before you call us out as hypocrites for spending a lot on art: not all of us do that, and many only look at art others have made and commissioned, just like in any museum, for free or for a low price. Some artists actually need help, and patrons could do a great service to them. Nobody is forcing you to commission hundreds of pictures, for example, as I stated more or less on the previous essay, it’s just a status symbol but not a necessity. By itself, it doesn’t define you as a person. I personally don’t care about them, but they simply do not represent everyone. On them not allowing reuse or reposting without permission: some artists actually want to know what their art is associated with. Trust me, I hate artists being overly restrictive with this, but you literally have Pepe the Frog, originally a character from a random comic, being associated with the alt-right. And guess what? The creator Matt Furie is now suing organizations for using his character. There’s even a documentary about it. (1) Piracy actually harms small creators, regardless of your views on it. Something similar happens with reposting. And I won’t bother arguing about the “AI is not theft” argument. You can get carbon copies of anything if you prompt it the right way. “But you could do the same on any other medium!”. I remember there was actually a video of someone prompting the word “Icelandic” onto Suno or Udio and got Björk’s voice. That’s one proof. Try prompting something vague and see if you get something familiar. (2) Even if we argue about the legality or morality of collages, sampling, etc. you only get partial credit, regardless. Nobody is saying the source material is theirs. And when the machine does it all for you, what is it?

Does AI even “empower” anyone? In practice, only if you want to mass produce “art”, even if we ignore the theft of content. By doing so, you’re actively making it more difficult for others to express themselves as they like. You’re flooding the zone with low-effort content (literally what “slop” means) so much

so that artist who actually put in the effort are left behind, and are less likely to get noticed. It’s essentially like doping in sports. Those who actually put in the effort get left out, and if you tell them to adopt AI, you’re essentially forcing them to stop using their skills for themselves. **If AI was actually a tool, why does it let us even generate the ideas i.e., the *prompts*? Or every detail? Why is there even the possibility of it doing everything for you?**

I don’t want to argue these points over and over, these have been discussed ad nauseam elsewhere. All you need to know is: **the goal is to supplant everything humans create, and softly suppressing the masses’ creation and control of actual culture, by overshadowing those who actually create, and deskilling everyone with the more convenient and easier to use AI.** One more thing, local models in practice don’t change anything in the long term. You’ll be overshadowed by the “slop” prompted by the more powerful, or the more accessible services controlled by the companies, who push it in the first place. The same thing will happen to those who actually create art. And **it’s almost as if the tech was created intentionally to deceive**. Not only with technique, but with reality itself. It has always been possible, but it took effort, and this lowered the barrier of entry.

(1) https://www.feelsgoodmanfilm.com/
(2) Can’t find the video now but if not, a Facebook post showing that “music creators”, by pure chance, got famous singer’s voices Udio & AI Music Creators | I randomly got Bjork's voice 😹 | Facebook